

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/490,783	JOHNSON, RICHARD C.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Luke Gilligan	3626	

**All Participants:**

(1) Luke Gilligan.

(2) Alan Young.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 19 August 2005

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 JOSEPH THOMAS  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's representative indicated that an RCE was submitted on June 8, 2005. After discussion, it appeared that the submission did not meet all of the requirements for a proper RCE. Therefore, the Examiner informed Applicant's representative that the application was considered abandoned but that a petition for revival could be filed. .